(54)

S R 22 – 1894

1 – 12 Sls

Endsed

Complaint of Rama Rao, against the sale of Vaddys Vend farms & his Inam villages."

(1)

SECTION § R

FILE NO. 22-94

SERIAL NO.

Notes on page ii of the Correspondence or in Sl 3.

Petitioner asserts that darkhasts for larger sums were ignored and that the farms in question were given away to the last year's lessee for the same rental as in last year. The Dy Comm'r has disposed of this important allegation by merely saying that he is given to understand that it is not true. The sale-lists have not been submitted nor any report or any statement obtained from the Amildar and other persons present at the sale. Petr asserts that darkhasts were actually given to the late Dy Comm'r he must be ——

called upon to
substantiate his
assertion. We beg
Council's attention as
regards the Queens
-hall Forum is
very meagre. We
no shop
Meet at any time
been it in the pipes
but opened last
year: What was
the result realized
from it last year.
What are the facilities
likely to be required
early opened by
a shop at Queens
-hall?: On these
points, full infor-
-tion should be
furnished.

Draft agmt
1-11-95

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

SECTION SR

FILE No. 28. 95.

SERIAL No.

REVENUE BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. Complaint by the Jahgirdar of Kandanur, nanganad Taluk about certain irregularities alleged to have been committed at the time of the sale of toddy vend farms of his inam villages for 1895–96.

LAST REFERENCE. Letter No. 6244 dated 8th February 95 & No 266 1496 by 1578 1595 from the Excise Commr in Mysore

Rama Rao, the Jahgirdar complained in his petition dated 28th June 95 to the following effect:—

(1) that, in disposing of the toddy vend farms of his inam villages for 1895–96, he was not consulted beforehand.

(2) that Darkhasts for larger sums were ignored & the contract given to the previous year's farmer for the same rental as in the previous year.

(3) that Darkhasts for higher amounts were actually presented to him by Commr

(4) that the toddy shop at

Mandankalli inam village was abolished to the prejudice of the toddy revenue of his Inam villages.

The petition was referred to the Excise Commr for report, and in the correspondence submitted the Dy Commr Mysore Distt said

that due publicity was given to the sale by beat of drum as well as by free distribution of notifications

that the petitioners statement that darkhasts were received for larger sums was not true

and that the shop at Mandankalli village was ordered to be abolished on the representation made by the neighbouring toddy vend farmers for 1895-96 to the effect that they sustained heavy loss owing to the establishment of the shop in question for the first time in 1894-95.

As the above information was rather incomplete, the Excise Commr was again asked to submit a detailed report with a request that the petitioner should be called upon to substantiate the assertion that darkhasts for larger sums were actually received by the then Dy Commr.

In the detailed reports received with the Excise Commr's letter under disposal, the Dy Commr, Mysore Distt states that

that no Darkhasts for larger sums were received by the Rev Dy Commr at the time of sale, which fact is well borne out by the depositions given by Soobrayagois, the agent of the Inamdar himself.

The only question then left for consideration is the abolition of the toddy shop at Mandarhalli one of the Inam villages. From the correspondence now received no definite information is available as to the existence of the toddy shop in question prior to 1894-95. The Excise Commr states that the shop does not seem to have been in continuous existence during the days of the late Contractors & submits for orders of Govt the question as to whether the Inamdar is not entitled to any compensation on account of the abolition of the shop, under the terms of the sanad which concede to the Inamdar the "items of Sayer & toddy."

Put up a draft calling for the Dy Commr's orders for the closing of the Shop & other papers connected therewith

(2)

Memo continued.

As per above order the Excise Commr was requested to obtain & submit the Dy Commr's order directing the abolition of the Mannahalli toddy shop in 1895-96, & in reply, ~~the~~ the (the Excise Commr) forwards for information the letter received from the Dy Commr, Mysore, in which it is stated that no written order of the Dy Commr (Mr. Ranganami Iyengar) abolishing the shop in question is forthcoming among the records of his office except the following ~~entries~~ in information on the point in question :—

(1) In the original sale list for 1895-96 no reference whatever is made to Mannahalli Shop.

(2) In an authenticated draft-statement of shops of the Nanjangud Taluk for 1895-96, the name of Mannahalli shop is mentioned with a remark ~~against it~~ that it is abolished

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore, also makes a reference to the authenticated ~~out~~ fair copy of the Statement sent to the Excise Commr., for further information but the latter in his letter under disposal states that no mention is made of the Mannahalli shop in the statement referred to by the Dy. Commr.

The above information does not help the disposal of the question under reference.

The question for decision is whether the Inamdar is entitled to any compensation ~~as~~ suggested by the Excise Commr. on account of his shop having been abolished. ~~by~~ ~~the Dy.~~ In the correspondence received with the Excise Commr's letter no. 1954/174 dt 24th October/95 the Dy. Commr., Mysore, stated that on the representation made ~~to the former Dy. Commr.~~ (~~Mr. Ranganathaiah Devapur~~) by the neighbouring toddy vend farmers at the time of sale for 1895-96 to the effect that there was no shop

S. no 8.

S. no 3 in note book.

at Mannahalli & that they
suffered a great loss by the
introduction of a shop there
in 1894-95, the shop in question
was abolished in 1895-96 under
the orders of the then Dy. Commr.
(Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar). In
the subsequent correspondence
on the matter, the Dy. Commr.,
Mysore stated, that when the ~~sho~~ toddy
contract for the whole district
was given out (note apparently
before 1890), Mannahalli shop
was not included in the contract,
that prior to 1892-93 (two previous years probably)
the shop was rented out to the
Heggeddevankote taluk contractor.
In 1893-94, it was found by the
Amildar of Nanjanpud, that
the shop ~~in~~ in question was
opened without a license for which
the delinquent was punished
The shop was licensed to be opened
as ~~application~~ in 1894-95 on an
application made; and ~~lastly~~
in 1895-96, on the representation
made by the Heggeddevankote
taluk contractor & the ~~Mysore~~
shop keepers of the Mysore
taluk that they suffered loss
owing to the establishment of

the shop at Mannahalli, that the sale of the shop was not effected. The above information re the existence of the shop was put by the Excise Commr in his letter dated 18th February 18 in a brief way - that the shop did not appear to have been in continuous existence during the days of the late Contractors. That the shop was abolished in 1895-96 under orders of the Dy Commr on the grievances made by the neighbouring Vend farmers, is also clear from the correspondence. Under these circumstances, the question for settlement is whether the Inamdar is entitled to any, and if so, to what Compensation

(note no information is also furnished as to the amount realized in the shop in any year)

Submitted, D Secretary
25/8/98

The complaint that Rajkot
lands were resumed but
rejected has not been
substantiated, nor the
allegation that Maharaja-
-kumari and
Thakor whose abolition in 1895/96
entitles the Petr to
compensation. Reject
the petition

31-8-99

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

SECTION S R.

FILE No. 28 94

SERIAL No. 1

No. 20

Name of Petitioner. Kanakoor - Japrdar of Kanakoor & the village residing in Port-Nigare

Village.

Taluk

District.

Date of Arzi. 28-6-95

Date of Receipt. 1-7-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 5

ABSTRACT.

States that though there were Darkhastdars who had consented to pay larger amount for draw loads from the date bars in the Jalar villages yet the Dy. Commr. Kanakoor (Mysore) without taking the above Darkhasts into consideration granted contract to the contractors and taken up the contract at the same last rates for the two years amount - that the above officer has also caused loss to Govt by abolishing the toll

Upon one of the Forest villages of Mannohalli - and that on referring to the present Dy. Conservator he furnished him an endorsement to say that the sale having already been conducted and confirmed the bid has been placed in hopes from the highest bidder and that his request to have the bid rejected cannot be complied with - Prays that on investigation the present Ajaredar's contract may be cancelled and the contract of the Forest Guard who has offered a larger sum may be accepted -

Prays further that the Dy. Conservator may be directed that pending disposal of his appeal the present Ajaredar may not be allowed to work out his contract - and that the above order should be served to the Dy. Conservator and he would pay the charge.

3/7.

Rev
7/11/95

P.D. No 123 dt 5/7/95 En 6
Sr 4

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

SECTION S.R.

FILE No. 79 9E11

SERIAL No. 2

The accompanying Petition No. 20 registered dated 28th June/95 received at the Dewan's Office from Rama Rao Jahagirdar of Kanganur and other Villages in the Ranganad Taluk, Complaining against the Sale of the Toddy Shops in his Rama village is forwarded, together with its 6 enclosures, to the Deputy Comr, Hlly for submission through the Revenue Comr Hlly for report

5/7/95

By Order,

Rev 5/7/95

Chief Secretary

BANGALORE, 189

5/7/95

M.G.C.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000





31/10/95 Called for papers 28. 96

Submitted with the memo quoted

8/11/95 to the Hon'ble Secy for orders 3.

8/11/95

J. H. J.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To Revenue
The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore,
~~Dept.~~

Dated 24th October 1895.
Despatched 26
Received
General No. 1954
No. 174 (in files)
Enclosure No.

In reply to Official Memorandum
No. 223, dated 5th July 1895.
Ex: 4
SUBJECT

Forwards copy of correspondence containing the results of the sales of the Toddy Vend Farms in the Inam Villages of Hanenur, Muddur and Kallahalli in the Nanjangud Taluk

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Refer a perusal of the memorandum of the Collector of Nanjangud dated 5th July 1895 No. 223 Ex: 4 which explains the reasons why the Toddy Vend Farms in the Inam Villages of Hanenur, Muddur and Kallahalli in the Nanjangud Taluk could not be sold in the year 1894-95 and why the Farmers in question were given away to the last year's lessee for the same rental as in last year. The Collector has also stated in his memorandum that the collection by auction is known to be unprofitable and it is not true. The Collector has not been submitted any report stating reasons why the Farmers were not sold at the sale held on the 28th ultimo. Refer a perusal of the Collector's memorandum and the letter from the Amildar of Nanjangud dated 8th instant and submit with the memo quoted in the margin for orders.

Continued to page 2

5a

Excise Commissioners Office

Bangalore, 24th October 1895.

No. 1954 (Enc 2 files) / 174 / From — 26

(3)

The Excise Commissioner

in Mysore.

To,

The Revenue Secretary to the

Government of Mysore.

Sir

In reply to your Official Memorandum No. 223 / Ex: 4, dated 5th July 1895, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of the marginally noted correspondence containing the results of the sales of the Toddy Vend Farms in the Inam villages of Kanémm, Muddur and Kallahalli in the Nanjangud Taluk

1. Docket No. 189, dated 30th July 1895. from the Dy Commissioner, Mysore District.
2. Docket No. 626, dated 3rd August 1895, 34 to — Do —
3. Docket No. 724, dated 21st October 1895, from — Do —

Taluk, belonging to Petitioner Ramarow, the Jahagirdar of the above villages, and explaining why no Toddy shop at Mandanahalli another Inam village belonging to the Petitioner, was put up to auction for the year 1895-'96.

2. The original Petition and its enclosures are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

S Mukerji
Extra Commissioner
in Mysore

K;

1895 Enclosure to (3/a)

Serial 3

From.

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Dated 30th July 1895.

Enclosures Nos. 7.

No. 189.

His official Memo No. 109 of the 11th July 1895 forwarding for report the petition of Rama Row, Jahagirdar of Kanénur and other villages in the Nanjangud Taluk complaining against the sale by Government of the Toddy shops in his Inam villages for 1895-96.

At the Sale of the toddy Vend farms of the Nanjangud Taluk for the year 1895-96 held on the 21st May 1895 by the former deputy Commissioner the Inam farms of the petitioner in his villages of Kanenur, Maddur and Kallahalli were respectively knocked down to the highest bidders for Rupees 8 Rupees 5-4-0 and Rs 6/- a month exclusive of local cess. The petitioner

petitioner says that higher bids were received at the sale, but the undersigned is given to understand that it is not true. But subsequently on the 21st of June 1895 the petitioner applied for the cancellation of the sale stating that he would otherwise be put to much loss and requested that the farms might be resold. He was informed in reply in this office Do. 149 of the 21st June 1895 that as the sales had already been concluded and confirmed it was not possible to comply with his request.

2. The petition under report and its enclosures are returned herewith.

/Signed/ B.K. Venkataravada Iyengar.
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

From
The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Dated 3rd August 1895.

Do. 626/34. (Enclosure 1 file)

The Deputy Commissioner's Do. 189, dated 30th July 1895, reporting upon the petition

Petition of the Jahagirdar of Kanenur, Inuddur, Kallahalli and Manahalli Inam villages in the Nunjungud taluk.

In reply has the honor to request further information on the following points:—

(1) Has Excise Revenue on Toddy been conceded to the above villages at the Inam Settlement. 2.

(2) How many date trees are there in each of the above villages. 2.

(3) What was the consumption of Toddy in 1894-95 — each of the shops at the above villages. 2.

(4) Was no notice of the sales of the shops and groves in the above villages, given to the Jahagirdar as usual. 2.

(5) Were any Dhurkasts received by the Deputy Commissioner for the above shops and groves at the time of the sales 2.

(6) Why were not the shop and grove of Manahalli sold for 1895-96. 2.

(7) Do any of the above shops get supplies

supplies of Toddy from Government groves, and if so, have such Government groves been separately sold?

2. The enclosures are herewith returned for reference and resubmission.

/Signed/ L. Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

E. Mysore No. 724

1895

From.

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Dated 21st October 1895.

No. 724.

Enclosures. Petition and its six enclosures.

His docket No. 626/34 of the 3rd August 1895, and reminder No. 1452 of the 25th September 1895, requesting further information regarding the petition of the Jahagirdar of Kannenur, Kallahalli, Maddur and Mandanahalli inam villages in the Nanjanged taluk.

I. Begs to state as follows:—

(1) The toddy revenue of the above villages

villages has been conceded to the Dumdar at the Inam Settlement as per title deeds noted in the margin

(2) In Kallahalli there are 450 date trees, in Kannenur 87, in Maddur 250 and in Mandanahalli 65.

(3) In 1894-95, 540 gadas of toddy were consumed in the Kallahalli shop, 520 gadas in the Kannenur shop, 720 gadas in the Maddur shop, and 180 gadas in the Mandanahalli shop.

(4) The Amildar of the Nanjangud taluk states that besides the free distribution of the copies of the printed Government notification of the toddy Sales for 1895-96 local Sathiars were also published as usual by beat of drums in all the villages concerned. The Dumdar was given no notice of the Sale in particular.

(5) The undersigned is given to understand that no dhurkast was received for these shops and groves at the time of the Sales.

(6) The undersigned is given to understand that as it was represented to the former Deputy Commissioner at the time of the toddy Sales for 1895-96 that there was no shop in Mandanahalli and that the Farmers of the neighbouring toddy vend Farms had been put to a great loss by the introduction of one there in 1894-95 he decided not to permit a shop there.

(7)

For Kallahally in title deed General No. 57617 / T.D 76 dated 1-12-80
For Kannenur in title deed General No. 57615 / T.D 74 dated 1-12-80
For Maddur in title deed General No. 57614 / T.D 78 dated 1-12-80
For Mandanahally in title deed General No. 57618 / T.D 79 dated 1-12-80

(7) Kannenur shop gets its supply of toddy from a portion of the Government grove of Hullahalli, which has been sold separately for Rupees 8 a month. The shops in other villages get their supply of toddy from the trees in these villages.

II. The enclosures to the docket under reply are returned herewith.

(signed) B. K. Venkatavaradayyar
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore district.

"Copy"

Marketh
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

M.

Gen. 31.]

1895

SECTION S-R.

FILE No. 98-961 From

SERIAL No. 4

4

To The Ld Lieutt
& Govr

Dated 12th November 1895.

Despatched 14

Received

General No. 4621

No. Sr. 139

Enclosure No. 1 file

Ld Lieutt No 1954-174
of the 24th Ult forwarding report on the result of the Sales of certain Crown Forests in the Nanyandode Valley belonging to Ram Dhan the Jahgalpuldar

1. In returning the enclosed file received with the above letter to Simla as follows

(1) The petitioner asserts that discharges for large pines were given, and that the forests in question

question were given away to the last year's lease for the same rental as in last year - The Dy: Jun[r]. has disposed of this important allegation by merely saying that he is given to understand that it is not true. The rule nisi has not been submitted, nor any report or statement obtained from the Amildar and other persons present at the sale. -

(2) The Petitioner avers that allowances were actually given to the late Dy: Jun[r]. He must be called upon to substantiate this averment

(3) The Dy: Jun[r]. report as regards the Mandavelly Talav is very meagre - Did no such exist there at any time? Was it for the 1st time opened last year? What was the rental realized from it last year? What are the farms likely to be prejudicially affected by a drop at Mannakally? Further points for information should be furnished. -

K. G.

12-11-95

Rev: Secy.

12-11-95

S. D. J.

11/11/95

15?

5787

Gen. 30] (8) 1897

From

The Excise Commissioner

in Mysore

SECTION S.R.

FILE NO. 28.95/1

SER'AL NO. 5

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

General and Revenue Dept. S.

Dated 8th February 1898

Despatched /0

Received

General No. 6244

No. 266

Enclosure No. /

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Submits copy of correspondence containing information on the several points referred to in the Secretary's docket No. 4261/139, dated 12/14 November 1895, regarding the complaint of Ramadas about the toddy revenue of his Inam villages in the Nanjangud taluk.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Submitted with [illegible] Vernacular records referred to have not been received.

No. 6244
266 Encl 1

Excise Commissioner's Office,
Bangalore, 8th February 1898.

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith, copy of the marginal correspondence containing information on the several points referred to in your docket No. 4261/139, dated 12th/14th November 1895, regarding the complaint of Rama Rao about the toddy revenue of his Inam villages Kaveniur, Maddur, Kallahalli and Mandanahalli in the Nanjangud Taluk

1. Letter No. 1737, dated 26th January 1897, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.
2. Docket No. 4074/152, dated 1st February 1897, to — do — do
3. Docket No. 105, dated 28th August 1897, from — do — do
4. Docket No. 2040/67, dated 4th September 1897, to — do — do
5. Docket No. 260, dated 14th December 1897, from — do — do

2. It will be seen from the above correspondence that the toddy shop

ds

Mandanahalli does not appear to have been in continuous existence during the days of the late Contractors & ~~Mandanahalli~~ Melb was abolished in 1895-96 by the then Deputy Commissioner on the ground of its close proximity to the shops in the Heggadadévanakoté and Mysore Táluks.

3. In the Inám Settlement Register the following order is recorded by the Inám Superintendent in regard to the Abkári Revenue of the villages:— "The items of Sáyar and Toddy are conceded as per the Sannad. The item of arrack is reserved." I leave for the consideration and orders of Government the question as to whether the Inámdár is not entitled to any compensation on account of his shop having been abolished by the Deputy Commissioner.

4. The file of vernacular papers received

received from the Deputy Commissioner
is herewith sent for reference and not
kind return.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant,
M Murugaya
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

No. 1737.

Enclosure to 89 (8 & W)

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Mysore District,
Dated Mysore, January 26th, 1897

From

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District;

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 6081/239, dated the 8th January 1897, calling for information on certain points connected with the complaint of Ráma Ráo, Jahágirdár of Kanenur and other villages in the Nanjangud Táluk, regarding certain irregularities in the sale of toddy farms of his Inám villages for 1895-96, I have the honor to

to state that the Amildár of the Nanjangúd Táluk reports that no higher bid than Rs. 194-7-u was received on behalf of the Jahágirdár, while the sale was being conducted by Mr. Rangaswámi Iyengár, the then Deputy Commissioner. One Subba-raya Jois, a representative of the Jahágirdár, was examined by the Amildár, and in his statement (to be found in the file) he has clearly asserted that nobody came forward to bid at the proper time.

2. During the years prior to 1892-93, the Manahalli shop was rented out to the Hegga-dadévankoté Táluk contractor

When the Shéndi of the whole District was rented out to only one contractor, this shop was not included

included in the contract. In 1893-94, it was found by the Amildár that the shop in question had been opened without a license having been first obtained for the same, and the party was therefore criminally prosecuted and punished. In 1894-95, one Veera applied for a license to open the shop at Hanahalli, which was granted. But in 1895-96, on the complaint of loss made by the toddy contractor of Heggadadévankoté, and the shopkeepers of the Mysore Táluk, it was ordered that the sale of the shop should not be effected.

3. Jahágirdár Rama Row's petition with

with its enclosures received with your Memorandum No. 2261/108, dated the 17th November 1896, is herewith re-transmitted.

I have, &c.,
(sd) T. Madiah,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Enclosure to No 5

No. 4074/152, dated 1st/3rd February 1897.

From The Excise Commissioner in Mysore,
To The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

The Deputy Commissioner's No. 1737, dated the 26th January 1897, re-porting on the complaint of Rama Rao, Jahagirdar of Kaneenur and other villages in the Nanjangud Taluk.

In reply has the honor to-

request

request that the file of any Dar-
-khasts received even after the
sale was closed, with the orders
passed thereon, together with the
sale lists, may be sent for sub-
-mission to Government.

2. Begs that the petitioner
may be summoned and called
upon to substantiate his as-
-sertion, as required in clause (2)
of the Secretary's No. 4621 / Ex: 139, dated
the 12th November 1895.

[Signed] B.N. Purnaiya,
Excise Commissioner.

Enclosure to No 5

From The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

No. 105.

Dated 28th August / 1st September 1897.

Sir

Enclosure to Sl. No. 6

His docket No. 4074/152, dated the 1st February 1897.

I have the honor to forward herewith the statement of Subráya Jois, agent of the Jahágirdár of Kanéniur. From this statement it is evident that the original Darkhásts were returned to the Darkhástdárs, as the Darkhásts were received long after the toddy leases of the Nanjangúd Táluk were settled for 1895–96, and that they (the original Darkhásts) are not forthcoming in the Jahágirdár's office.

2. From the statement it also appears that the Jahágirdár

or

or his Agent was informed by the Darkhástdárs that they gave the Darkhasts to the late Deputy Commissioner and that there is no written reference to substantiate this statement.

3. The Agent was directed to produce within a week the copies of Darkhásts which were given to the Jahágirdár. The Agent has not produced the same up to the present.

4 The vernacular papers connected with the petition of the Jahágirdár are herewith forwarded.

[signed] M. Shámá Ráo,
For Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District

Enclosure to No 5

No. 2041/67 Dated 4th/5th September 1897.

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

The Deputy Commissioner's No. 105, dated 1st instant.

In reply has the honor to request to be informed whether the Nanahalli toddy shop was sold for 1896-97, and if not, how the Deputy Commissioner proposes to meet the claim of the Inámdár to the revenue of the shop for the years in which the shop was not sold,

in

in the event of the Inámdár proving his right to Excise Revenue.

[Signed] W. Vincombe Davy,
For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Enclosure to No. 5.

No. 260. Dated 14th December 1897.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District,

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

His docket No. 2040/67, dated the 4th September 1897.

Has the honor to state that from the Nanjangúd Táluk Amildár's report No. 82, dated the 19th May 1896, it would appear that in order to avoid the loss which otherwise would have been sustained by the contractors of the Heggadadévankoté

Heggadadévankote and Nuysore Táluks.
Mr. Rangaswámiyengár, the then Deputy
Commissioner, abolished the Kundana-
halli Dukán so far back as 1895.
Ever since the Dukan in question
has not been opened, and consequently
the Inámdár cannot claim the
toddy revenue for this Dukán.

2. The Vernacular papers are
herewith retransmitted.

(Signed) M. Shámá Ráo,
For Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

"Copy"
M. Krishnayya

To
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

SECTION S.R.

FILE No. 28-98 J

SERIAL No. 6 J

Draft for approval

(9)

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

D/ 2/3/98

Dcopy

No: 8075

Ex 308

His letter No: 62 44 / 266 dy 8th February 1898 submitting a report on the complaint of Rama Rau Jahagirdar of Kosenur &c regarding the Toddy Revenue of his Inam villages in the Nanjangud Taluk.

With reference to para 2 of the above, has the honour to request that ~~a copy of~~ the Deputy Commr's order directing the abolition of the Mandanahalli Shop in 1895-96, may be obtained and submitted together with other papers connected therewith.

By Order

1/3/98

Secretary.

28/2/98

Excise Commissioner's Office

No: 6075/304

S.R. Bangalore, dated 3rd August 1898

4

Received 28-9-98

Serial No. 7

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No: 6075/304, dated 2nd March 1898, calling for the Mysore District Deputy Commissioner's order directing the abolition of the Mandanahulli toddy shop in 1895-96, together with other connected papers, I have the honor to solicit that the file of papers sent with my letter No: 6244/266, dated 8/10th February 1898, may be kindly returned, as the Deputy Commissioner has, in his docket No: 58, of 29th July 1898, applied for them for reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

[signature]

For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

1886

Ex: 53

Gen. 30]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
G.A.No. 855
1898 AUG.8 - 1898
RECEIPTS OFFICE

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General & Revenue Dept.

Dated 3rd August 1898

Despatched 4

Received

General No. 981

No. 48

Enclosure No.

In reply to Secretary's docket No: 6075/308, dated 2nd March 1898.

SUBJECT.

Solicits that the file of papers, regarding the toddy revenue of Mandanahully etc, sent with this office No: 6244/266, dated 8/10 February 1898, may be returned.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Rev 5/8/98

13.8.98

Sd with draft

15/8/98.

(13) 32 Request for copy

SECTION 3R

FILE No. 98 · 98/1

SERIAL No. 8

To Revenue Commr in Mysore

No 1281.
Ex. 65

Dated 16 August 98.
16 Encl. 1 P

His letter no 981/48 dated 3rd August 98 requesting the return of the file of papers sent with his letter no 6244/266 dated 8th February 1898 ~~may be returned for reference~~ reg: the Doddy revenue of certain Inam Villages belonging to Ramachar Jahagirdar of Konanur.

Has the honor to return herewith the file of papers asked for in the above and to request that they may be returned with the papers referred to in this Office no. 875 dated 2.3.98

15/8/98

For Secretary
15/8/98

23

561
En 25

Excise]

1899. (16)

SECTION SR

FILE No. R 95

SERIAL No. 9

From The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

To THE SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF MYSORE,
General & Revenue Depts.

Dated 24th July 1899.

Despatched 25th do

Received

General No. 487

No. 26 Enclosure No.

Reminder to Docket No 1281 14.8.98 Exc. 9

In reply to Secretary's reminder no. 745 dated 22nd instant. Ex 7/90/95-96
SUBJECT.

States that the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore district, has been asked to report the cause of delay in replying to the reference on the subject quoted in the above

26.7.99

References
to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Submitted with reference to this office reminder Sl no 15

KS 29/7/99

No. 487/26

Excise Commissioner's office
Bangalore, dated 24th/25th July 1899

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to Government
General and Revenue Department

Sir,

In reply to your reminder No. 745 Ex. 19 of 1895 9, dated 22nd instant, calling for early submission of certain papers, &c. relating to Inam villages belonging to Rama Rao, Jaghirdar of Konanur &c., I have the honor to State that the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, has been asked to report the cause of delay in replying to the reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

L. Venkata Lingaiya

For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

35

Excise]

Received 1069
AUG 16 99
DEWAN'S OFFICE

Ex. 50.

1899

17

SECTION Ex.
FILE NO. 29.95
SERIAL NO. 10

From The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

To THE SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF MYSORE,
General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 15th
Despatched 15th } August 1899.
Received

General No. 1496
No. 50
Enclosure No. 1 to 1a & 1b

In reply to secretary's reminder No. 745 dated 22nd July 1899, and to No. 8025 dated 22nd March 1898. SUBJECT.

Submits copy of communication from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, regarding the abolition of Mamahalli Inam shop, Nanjangud taluk, in the year 1895-96.

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Ex M 16.8.99 Submitted with office memo continued.
19/31/8/99

No. 1496
50
Encl: 1 & a file

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, dated 15th August 1899

From.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to Government
General and Revenue Department

Sir,

In reply to your reminder No 745 / Ex. F. 19 of 95-96, dated 22nd July 1899, and docket-No. 8075 / Ex 308, dated 2nd March 1898, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of docket-No. 69, dated 11th instant, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, together with its original enclosures regarding the abolition of Immamahalla Imam shop, Hangavad Taluk, in the year 1895-96. The fair copy of the statement received in this Office

Office (referred to in para 3 of the — Deputy Commissioners docket), does not contain the Mannahalli shop, as it comprises only the details of the shops which were actually sold for the year 1895–96.

I have the honor to be,

sir,

your most obedient servant

[signature]

For Inverarity
in Mysore
DR



Gen. 81]

Enclosure 2

1899.

Sl 10

17/a

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Chief Commissioner
in Mysore

Dated 11th
Despatched
Received
} August 1899.

General No. 69
No.

Enclosure No.

His official memo-
=randum No. 6570/285 dated
3rd/4th March 1898 forward-
=ing for compliance copy
of Secretary's docket-
No 8075/En 308 dated 2nd March
1898 anent the submission
of Deputy Commissioner's
order directing the —
abolition of Inamahalli

Inam

Inam shop in 1895-96.

—o.—

Has the honor to state in reply that no written order of the Dpty Commissioner abolishing the shop in question is forthcoming among the records of this office, which have been carefully searched.

2. It will be seen from the accompanying original sale list for 1895-96 that no reference is made herein to Inamahalli shop.

3. An unauthenticated draft statement of shops of Inamyard taluk for 1895-96, which was found among the records is herein enclosed. In this statement the name of Inamahalli shop is mentioned with a remark that it is abolished. The authenticated fair copy is probably available in the Excise Commissioner's office, and the undersigned would beg kind reference thereto for information.

"Copy" (Sd) P. Srinivasa Rao
For Dpty Commissioner
Mysore
For Excise Commissioner

Enclosure to
letter dt. 10
1/7/95

X X

Ex-5

Two rupees Stamp affd

PETITION
REG'D. NO. 20 R
DATE 1-7-95

I. ——

II. ——

III. ——

IV. ——

V. ——

VI. ——

VII. ——

VIII. ——

194-7-

222-2—

IX. —

X. —

XI. —

XII. —

XIII. —

XV. ——

28/6/95

A 44

A 158

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 7

1893 [illegible]

[illegible] 1894 [illegible]

15 [illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

15 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] 31-1-93 [illegible]

B X

46

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

11—6—98 [illegible]   [illegible]

[illegible]

47

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 95-96 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 10-6-1898

D 48

97

12-6-1895

49 ಕೆ.

ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

1. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಉತ್ತೇಜಿಸಲು ಮತ್ತು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಂಡಳಿಯು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಅನುಸೂಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ.

2. ಯಾವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅನುಸೂಚಿಯ ಕಾಲಂ ೨ ರಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

3. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಮೂವತ್ತು ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದು.

4. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಯಾವುದೇ ಘೋಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯು ಆ ಅವಧಿಯ ಅವಸಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ರದ್ದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

5. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಯಾವುದೇ ಘೋಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯು ಆ ಅವಧಿಯ ಅವಸಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ರದ್ದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಿನಾಂಕ 12 ಜುಲೈ 1895

ಸೇವೆಗೆ

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಒಡೆಯರ್ ಅವರು

ಮೈಸೂರು

ಮಹಾಶಯರೇ,

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿದೆವು. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ನಿಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಇಂತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ,

ಕೆ. ಶಿವರಾಮಯ್ಯ

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

14-6-95

2 & 5 as per order



Read:— (18)

petition registered no 20 dated 28th June 1895 from the Rama Row Sahagredar of Konenur & other villages, Nanjanged Taluk, complaining inter alia that at the time of disposing of the toddy Vend Farms of the Mannahalli Inam village for 1895-96, the Darkhasts for higher bids were rejected by the Deputy Commr and that the toddy shop at Mannahalli was ordered to be abolished, causing loss to the petitioner of the toddy Revenue of his Inam village.

Thereby

Also Correspondence ending with letter no 1496/50 dated 15th August 1896 from the Excise Commr on the subject

subject

No 2247 9/12/99

Ex. F. 1895-96

Encl 7/P

Order thereon:

~~Allowed~~

~~It will be seen from~~ submitted disclose

the records that the complaint

that higher bids were received

but rejected, has not been

substantiated, nor the allegation

that mannahalli shop is an

old one whose abolition in 1895-96

entitles the petitioner to compensation.

The ~~petitioner~~ petition is therefore

rejected

9-9-99

5/9/99

6/9/99 for Secretary

11/9/99

20

The Dresse Commr. C. with vernacular records -

11/9/99

SECTION S.R.
FILE No. 78 94
SUB No. 13

No 2248 dt 12/9/99
Ex F 1997-98

(19)

మైసూరు శిల్పియల్లరువ వంజనగుడుశిల్పుల
శనగేనూరు వగ్గేరి గ్రామగళజడుగిరోదారోవ
రాయలిగే ఇండెంట్లో

డిప్యుటీకమిషనర్లు 1895-96నేఇసివి
యల్లి శేందిభాగు దొరాజోవేళ్లినంమైనాం
గ్రామగళగే హోటాహోటియింద దొరాజోజు
రిగినదే హొత్తళింద, మండాదళ్లి గ్రామద
దురానన్న మొకుహోమాడిద్దరింద ఊనష్టలుం
టాగిరువదాగివగ్గేరిగుజరాయిసికొండ 189
నేఇసివి జూనామాడే 28నేమతుమినసిన్మా
అజీఉయన్న ఈసంబంధదల్లి యీక్లోడు కమిష
నరింద దొరమాడికొండవిశేష్టరికారదన్న
ప్రదుపరిన్మా రినిలాయితు - దొరాజోకాలదల్లిబి
దదరఖాస్తిగళు బందిద్దలవుగళు అంగీకరి
రిసల్పడలల్లవేంబుఅంశవు, 1895-96నేఇసి
వియల్లి మొకుహోమాడ్దల్పట్టనభినష్టి
కేపరిదారవన్న హొందువలుదశేయన్నుంటు
మాడువదేంబి మణ్ణళ్లి దుశాను హోవదిం
లూలవిబిన్నవాగి కేంచిలంశవూకూడిద్ద
ధ్రపట్టిరువదిల్లవాగినిమ్మా అజీఉయన్నకే
న్మేరినిరుకే ~~[illegible]~~ శిల్పియువదు
బుతిరిదిలు.

By Order
6-9-99
Addl Secretary